



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,622	07/13/2001	Marco Michael Rengan	RPS920010005US1	2989
45503	7590	07/13/2005	EXAMINER	
DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759			NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2677	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/904,622

Applicant(s)

RENGAN ET AL.

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed on 4/21/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 24-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 24-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Application has been examined. The claims 1-7 and 24-37 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 24-25, 27, 29-32, 34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chee (US 5,694,141).

Regarding claims 1, 24, 31, Chee discloses in figure 15, a method for providing displaying control on a computer system having a first display device (LCD 14) and a second display device (CRT 24), the method comprising allocating a first memory location (56) for storing contents to be displayed by said first display device, wherein said first memory location is accessible by a video display controller (122), allocating a second memory location (56') for storing contents to be displayed by said second display device, wherein the second memory location is accessible by said video display controller; in response to a selection of a split display mode, retaining information in the first memory location and updating information in said second memory location, such that contents displayed on said first display device are different from contents displayed on the second display device (see col. 17, lines 45-54). Chee also teaches that

Art Unit: 2677

both displays can display concurrently the same image (see col. 5, lines 24-25). Thus Chee practically teaches two modes of operation for two displays: concurrent, wherein both displays present identical images, and split display mode, wherein displays present different images. However, Chee is short of suggesting that the two modes can be switched between in response to a selection. But it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made, that given the fact that two displays can be operated in two different modes, these two modes would require some selection mechanism to realize the two modes. Adding such a selection would not require any undue experimentation and won't bring any unexpected results, rendering such addition obvious.

Regarding claims 2, 25, 32, Chee discloses the identification information as discussed above, further includes providing information from a frame buffer (38, fig. 5) to the first and second memory locations (56, 56').

Regarding claims 4, 27, 34, Chee discloses in figure 6 the providing identical information further includes setting a pointer pointing from a frame buffer (66) to said first and second memory locations (56, 56').

Regarding claims 6, 29, 36, Chee discloses the first display device (CRT) is external from said computer system and the second display device (LCD) is internal to said computer system (see fig. 5)

Art Unit: 2677

Regarding claims 7, 30, 37, Chee discloses the selection between the concurrent and split display mode are made via a soft key function (see central processing unit CPU with input device and may run a program see col. 6, lines 26-33).

5. Claims 3, 5, 26, 28, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chee (US 5,694,141) in view of Komeichi (US 5,929,871).

Chee discloses every feature of the claimed invention, excluding the updating information further includes allocating a second frame buffer; and providing information from the second frame buffer to the second memory location while providing information from the frame buffer to the first memory location; or the updating information further includes allocating second frame buffer and setting a second pointer pointing from said second frame buffer to the first memory location. Komeichi discloses in figures 4-5 a second frame buffer (39); and providing information from the second frame buffer to the second memory (see second store region 39-2) location while providing information from the frame buffer (38) to said first memory location (see first store region 39-1); or the updating information further includes allocating second frame buffer (39) and setting a second pointer pointing from said second frame buffer (39-3) to said first memory location (see first store region 39-1) (see column 3, lines 35-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a second frame buffer; and providing information from said second frame buffer to said second memory location while providing information from said frame buffer to said first memory location as taught by Komeichi into the system having the first and second

display of Chee because this would improve the utilization efficiency of the memory capacity provided by memories forming the frame buffer part relatively simple circuit.

Response To Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/21/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 3 of the Office Action: "The Examiner states that Chee does not disclose the claimed providing step, but the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to select a concurrent display mode to provide identical information to the first and second memory locations such that contents displayed on the first display device are identical to contents displayed on the second display device". Applicant also states that "Examiner's reasoning is based on Chee's teachings of both display devices having the same image in col. 5, lines 24-25. In col. 5, lines 24-25, Chee does mention that "both display devices (in the '109 patent) will show the same image". But Chee continues to mention that " '109 patent is not believed to relate to the driving of two display devices simultaneously, with each display device showing a different image". Thus, it is clear that it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify an apparatus, such as a graphics controller, that is capable of displaying same image on two display devices to display different images on the two display devices, or vice versa". Examiner respectfully disagrees because the discussion is related to the prior art. On the other hand, Chee also teaches the two displays to be driven simultaneously with the same or different image (see col. 5, lines 24-25 and col. 5, lines 57-59). Furthermore, Applicant also

Art Unit: 2677

states that Chee teaches the different images can be presented on different displays simultaneously, but Chee does not teach or suggest that the information in the first memory location are retained and the information in the second memory location are updated. Examiner also disagrees because Chee teaches the information in the first memory location is retained and the information in the second memory location is updated (see the two displays 56, 56' and two memory spaces, see col. 17, lines 45-54). For these reasons, these rejections are maintained.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2677

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimnhung Nguyen
July 8, 2005



ALEXANDER EISEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600